

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,

v.

RHONDA FIRESTACK-HARVEY, LARRY  
HARVEY, MICHELLE GREGG, ROLLAND  
GREGG, and JASON ZUCKER,  
Defendants.

No. CR-13-24-FVS

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS TO  
DISMISS ON EQUAL  
PROTECTION OR DUE PROCESS  
GROUND

**THE DEFENDANTS** have filed a number of motions. The Court considered their motions at a pretrial conference that was held on April 22 and 23, 2014. This order addresses the defendants' allegations that the instant prosecution is depriving them of equal protection and due process.

**CONGRESS AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

The defendants argue the United States Attorney's decision to prosecute them in the Eastern District of Washington violates their right to equal protection, as guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment, given Congress' decision to allow the medicinal use of cannabis in the District of Columbia. The Ninth Circuit considered and rejected a very similar argument in *James v. City of Costa Mesa*, 700 F.3d 394 (9th Cir.2012) *cert. denied*, --- U.S. ----, 133 S.Ct. 2396 (2013). There, the plaintiffs were disabled residents of the State of

1 California. They challenged attempts by certain California cities to  
2 close marijuana dispensing facilities. The plaintiffs relied  
3 principally upon Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act  
4 ("ADA"). 700 F.3d at 396. However, the plaintiffs also made an equal  
5 protection argument based upon the fact Congress did not block  
6 implementation of Initiative 59 in the District of Columbia in 2010.  
7 "Initiative 59," explained the Ninth Circuit, "suspended local  
8 criminal penalties for seriously ill individuals who use medical  
9 marijuana with a doctor's recommendation." 700 F.3d at 404. The  
10 circuit court rejected the argument that Congress' 2010 decision to  
11 allow the District of Columbia to implement Initiative 59 deprived  
12 disabled California residents of equal protection of the law:

13 Congress' decision not to block implementation of Initiative  
14 59 did not result in the unequal treatment of District of  
15 Columbia and California residents. On the contrary,  
16 Congress' actions allow these jurisdictions to determine for  
17 themselves whether to suspend their local prohibitions on  
18 the use and distribution of marijuana for medical purposes.  
19 Local decriminalization notwithstanding, the unambiguous  
20 federal prohibitions on medical marijuana use set forth in  
21 the [federal Controlled Substances Act] . . . continue to  
22 apply equally in both jurisdictions, as does the ADA's  
23 illegal drug exclusion. There is no unequal treatment, and  
24 thus no equal protection violation.

700 F.3d at 405 (citation omitted).

#### **ENTRAPMENT BY ESTOPPEL**

25 Defendant Michelle Gregg claims state authorities misled her  
26 concerning the use of marijuana for medical purposes. She claims

1 federal authorities were equally misleading. (Defendant's Motion &  
2 Memorandum (ECF No. 213) at 31-32 (citations omitted).) She moves to  
3 dismiss the indictment on the ground she is a victim of entrapment by  
4 estoppel, which is the "unintentional entrapment by an official who  
5 mistakenly misleads a person into a violation of the law[.]" *United*  
6 *States v. Schafer*, 625 F.3d 629, 637 (9th Cir.2010) (internal  
7 punctuation and citation omitted). Entrapment by estoppel is an  
8 affirmative defense. In order to prevail, Ms. Gregg must prove five  
9 elements: "(1) an authorized government official empowered to render  
10 the claimed erroneous advice, (2) who has been made aware of all the  
11 relevant historical facts, (3) affirmatively told him the proscribed  
12 conduct was permissible, (4) that he relied on the false information,  
13 and (5) that his reliance was reasonable." *United States v.*  
14 *Batterjee*, 361 F.3d 1210, 1216 (9th Cir.2004) (internal citations and  
15 quotation marks omitted). Ms. Gregg places great weight upon  
16 information that is contained in the Washington State Department of  
17 Health's website. The DOH has created a list of "General Frequently  
18 Asked Questions." One of them asks, "I heard the current federal  
19 administration legalized medical marijuana (cannabis). Is that true?"  
20 To that question, the DOH provided the following answer:  
21

22 No, medical marijuana (cannabis) is still illegal under  
23 federal law. However, U.S. Deputy Attorney General James  
24 Cole announced updated formal guidelines for federal  
25 prosecutors in states that have laws allowing the use of  
26 medical marijuana. The guidelines do not legalize medical  
marijuana. The president directed federal prosecutors to  
consider appropriate medical use when making criminal

1 charging decisions. The guidelines only provide direction  
2 for prosecutors when reviewing medical marijuana cases.  
3 (DOH, "[General] Frequently asked questions about Medical Marijuana  
4 (Cannabis) in Washington State," available at  
5 [http://www.doh.wa.gov/YouandYourFamily/Illnessand](http://www.doh.wa.gov/YouandYourFamily/IllnessandDisease/MedicalMarijuana(Cannabis)/GeneralFrequentlyAskedQuestions.aspx)  
6 [Disease/MedicalMarijuana\(Cannabis\)/GeneralFrequentlyAskedQuestions.aspx](http://www.doh.wa.gov/YouandYourFamily/IllnessandDisease/MedicalMarijuana(Cannabis)/GeneralFrequentlyAskedQuestions.aspx)  
7 x. (last visited April 21, 2014)). One cannot reasonably interpret  
8 the above-quoted answer as an affirmation that federal law permits the  
9 possession of marijuana for medical purposes. To the contrary, the  
10 above-quoted answer states unequivocally that the possession of  
11 marijuana remains illegal under federal law. Furthermore, the answer  
12 represents the views of the state Department of Health. At most, one  
13 could interpret the answer to suggest that, though the possession of  
14 marijuana remains illegal under federal law, the state Department of  
15 Health thinks there may be situations in which federal prosecutors  
16 will not seek the indictment of persons who possess marijuana for  
17 medical purposes. The state Department of Health does not presume to  
18 give any assurance as to when federal prosecutors will refrain from  
19 acting. Nor could the state Department of Health give any such  
20 assurance. It cannot speak for federal prosecutors. Thus, the answer  
21 given by the state Department of Health in response to a frequently-  
22 asked question will not support the defense of entrapment by estoppel.

#### 24 PROSCRIBING THE POSSESSION OF MARIJUANA

25 Several defendants have devoted scores of pages in multiple  
26 memoranda arguing Congress lacks a rational basis for continuing to

1 proscribe the possession of marijuana for medical purposes. A little  
2 over three months ago, the Ninth Circuit rejected very similar  
3 arguments in an unpublished opinion. *Sacramento Nonprofit Collective*  
4 *v. Holder*, Nos. 12-15991, 12-55775, 12-16710, 2014 WL 128998, at \*1-\*2  
5 (9th Cir. Jan. 15, 2014). Although the opinion may be unpublished, it  
6 accurately states the law in the Ninth Circuit.

7 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

8 1. Defendant Jason Zucker's motion to dismiss the indictment (**ECF**  
9 **No. 205**) is **denied**.

10 2. "[Defendant Michelle Gregg's] Motion . . . to . . . Dismiss  
11 Indictment" (**ECF No. 213**) is **denied**.

12 3. Defendant Rolland M. Gregg's "Motion to Dismiss" (**ECF No. 216**)  
13 is **denied**.

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The District Court Executive is hereby  
15 directed to enter this order and furnish copies to counsel.

16 **DATED** this 29th day of April, 2014.

17  
18 s/ Fred Van Sickle  
19 Fred Van Sickle  
20 Senior United States District Judge  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26